REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed November 19, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-24 are pending. No claims have been added, cancelled, or amended. Therefore, claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,336, 524 issued to Levine. Levine discusses the ability for a user to send a message to some else's pager, using a telephone system. The user types in the recipient's telephone number, and a numeric message. Levine's system converts the numeric message to a limited content message, and sends it to the recipient's pager. (Levine, Abstract). However, Levine's system allows one user to send a message to another user. This is fundamentally different from a device requesting data to be sent to the device. Furthermore, since Levine has a one-to-one match of a complete message (i.e. a few numerical digits) to a limited content message. Therefore, Levine does not teach, nor would it be functional to implement within Levine, the ability to recognize an automatically substituted code in the data.

Like Pinter discussed in a previous Office Action Response, Levine describes a paging system, in which the user can select from a list of "canned messages," which are selected by a code. Thus, for example, a short ASCII code may be used to transmit the message "I am on my way home." In order to send this message, the user initiating the message must known which "canned messages" are available, and must select the appropriate code to include the selected canned message. Levine does not teach or suggest the automatic substitution of codes, to replace text, images, etc. Furthermore,

Levine does not send data to a device in response to a request by the device. Rather, Pinter has a pager or similar device, to which a message is sent by a second party. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious over Levine.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,081,815 issued to Spitznagel, et al. Spitznagel describes a system that reformats hyperlinks to make them displayable on pagers that cannot decode or display hyperlinks in the conventional manner (underlined or bolded). (Spitznagel, Abstract). The Examiner refers to Spitznagel, column 6, lines 4-55. However, that portion of Spitznagel simply discusses reformatting a hyperlink, to eliminate undisplayable leading and trailing anchors in HTML. Spitznagel does not teach or suggest identifying an automatically substituted code in the data. In fact, the data Spitznagel receives does not have any automatically substituted code, and therefore Spitznagel cannot identify such substituted code. Therefore, the claims are not obvious over or anticipated by Spitznagel.

Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,081,815 issued to Spitznagel, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,594 issued to Cannon, et al. Cannon, like Levine, discusses the use of canned messages in sending a message via a telephone system or another pager to a recipient's pager. As noted above with respect to Levine, this does not teach or suggest sending a message to the device which requested it, with automatically substituted codes within the data stream. Therefore, Spitznagel in view of Cannon does not make the claims of the present invention obvious.

The Examiner further suggests that Cannon, at column 2, lines 28-53 describes a separate high bandwidth connection for transmitting the data. The cited portion of Cannon recites "Databases of the frequently transmitted information and the associated aliases are

preferably stored at the PUMs 105 and the system controller 110 ... [the PMU] includes a transceiver 205 for sending and receiving information over a radio frequency communication channel. (Cannon, column 2, lines 28-30 and lines 40-41). Cannon does not teach or suggest a <u>separate</u> high bandwidth connection for transmitting larger blocks of data.

Examiner further used Pepe, Schroeder, and Kovanen in combination with Spitznagel to reject some dependent claims.

Pepe discusses internet browsing in a limited bandwidth environment, and uses compression and filtering/dropping data as solutions. Pepe does not teach or suggest using codes to reduce bandwidth use. Therefore, Pepe does not remedy the shortcomings of Levine, Spitznagel, and Cannon.

Kovanen discusses a radio telephone, in which a removable memory stores the radio subscriber data and system-specific control parameters of the system. Kovanen does not teach or suggest a system that requests data, and substitutes codes. Kovanen does not teach or suggest the automatic substitution of codes for data elements. Therefore, Kovanen does not remedy the shortcomings of Levine, Spitznagel, and Cannon.

Schroeder discusses an improved user interface for a cellular phone, including predictive capabilities, to speed up data input by using word completion. . Schroeder does not teach or suggest the automatic substitution of codes to replace data elements. Therefore, Schroeder does not cure the shortcomings of Levine, Spitznagel, and Cannon. Therefore, the claims are not obvious over the combination of the above references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8300

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/19 2004

Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300